

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE STATE OF OREGON  
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY

**JOSHUA GAGNIER**  
individually and on behalf  
of others similarly situated

**Plaintiff**

vs

**SAFEWAY INC.**

**Defendant**

Case No. [REDACTED]

**CLASS ACTION  
COMPLAINT FOR  
EQUITABLE RELIEF**

Unlawful Trade Practices  
Unjust Enrichment

Jury Trial Requested  
Filing Fee Authority: ORS 21.135  
Not Subject to Mandatory Arbitration

1.

## INTRODUCTION

In an effort to profit and to obtain an unfair advantage over its competitors, Safeway misled thousands of Oregon customers into paying unlawful hidden surcharges on certain non-grocery items.

2

Any Oregon customer affected by Safeway's unlawful surcharge may contact [underdoglawyer.com](http://underdoglawyer.com) or call 503-222-2000 to file a claim for \$200 compensation.

3.

## FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

The Circuit Court for the County of Multnomah in Oregon has jurisdiction because the behavior alleged in this complaint took place in and around Multnomah County and because plaintiff's claim arises under the Oregon Unlawful Trade Practices Act, ORS 646.638.

4.

This complaint's allegations are based on personal knowledge as to plaintiff's own behavior and are made on information and belief as to the behavior of others.

5.

Plaintiff is an individual living in Portland, Oregon.

6.

Plaintiff is a “person” as that term is defined at ORS 646.605(4).

7.

Defendant is a Delaware corporation.

8.

Defendant is a “person” as that term is defined at ORS 646.605(4).

9.

Defendant regularly advertises and sells consumer goods in Oregon in the course of defendant's business.

10.

Throughout 2019 defendant advertised and provided non-grocery consumer goods to plaintiff and other class members in Oregon. Specifically, on October 18, 2019 defendant advertised and sold a bottle of Quail Oak Rose wine to plaintiff at defendant's store at 3527 SE 122nd in Portland. Defendant's sticker on its shelf advertised its bottle of wine to plaintiff as costing \$3.33. After plaintiff paid for the wine and later read his receipt, plaintiff discovered that defendant's sticker price was falsely advertised because defendant added and collected a hidden three cent surcharge in addition to the advertised price of its bottle of wine, causing plaintiff ascertainable loss of three cents.

11.

The consumer goods defendant advertised and provided to plaintiff and other class members were obtained primarily for their personal, family or household purposes.

12.

As alleged in this complaint, defendant made false or misleading representations of fact concerning plaintiff and other class members' cost for its consumer goods by falsely telling plaintiff and other class members that its consumer goods could be purchased for a certain price, when in fact defendant knew and should have known that defendant would add and collect from plaintiff and other class members a hidden surcharge in addition to the advertised price of its consumer goods.

13.

As alleged in this complaint, defendant's behavior as alleged above violated ORS 646.608(1)(s) and (u) and applicable Oregon Administrative Rules, causing plaintiff and other class members ascertainable loss of a surcharges they should never have been assessed, and loss of use of money and interest on surcharges they never should have been assessed.

14.

Defendant's violation of ORS 646.608 as alleged in this complaint was willful because defendant knew or should have known that its behavior as alleged in this complaint was an unlawful trade practice. Defendant has a repeated history of violating the Oregon Unlawful Trade Practices Act and defendant knew the sticker price on its shelves was lower than the price defendant actually charged and collected from its customers for certain non-grocery consumer goods.

15.

Defendant knew or should have known that Oregon law protects customers from unfair and deceptive surcharges.

16.

Defendant's violation of ORS 646.608 was reckless because the unfair and deceptive surcharges as alleged in this complaint were in pursuit of profit and stood to give defendant an unfair advantage over its competitors in the billion-dollar grocery business that chose to follow Oregon law.

1  
2                   **17.**

3                   Defendant is a multi-billion-dollar corporation with approximately 900  
4 locations and over 250,000 employees.  
5

6                   **18.**

7                   Defendant's behavior as alleged in this complaint was reprehensible, and  
8 violated the common standards required of corporations by the people of Oregon.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CAUSES OF ACTION****Claim One – Unlawful Trade Practices**

This claim is not a request for damages at this time, only equitable and injunctive relief. Plaintiff and the other class members intend to request damages in an amended complaint. As alleged in this complaint, defendant's behavior willfully violated ORS 646.608, causing plaintiff and the other class members an ascertainable loss of money. Under ORS 646.638 plaintiff requests an order that defendant's behavior violated ORS 646.608, entitling plaintiff to relief under ORS 646.638, reasonable attorney fees, costs and disbursements, an order prohibiting defendant from continuing to violate ORS 646.608, an order requiring defendant to provide an accounting of the unlawful surcharges it collected in violation of ORS 646.608 in the past year, and an order requiring defendant to preserve all documents and information (and electronically stored information) pertaining to this case.

20.

## **Claim Two – Unjust Enrichment**

This claim is not a request for damages at this time, only equitable and injunctive relief. As alleged in this complaint, defendant operated a common scheme to profit from the collection of misleading and unlawful surcharges that were not allowed by law. As a matter of justice and equity, defendant should not be able to retain the unlawful surcharges it collected from plaintiff and the other class members. Under a theory of unjust enrichment, plaintiff requests an order that defendant's behavior violated Oregon law, entitling plaintiff to reasonable attorney fees, costs and disbursements, an order prohibiting defendant from continuing to violate Oregon law, an order requiring defendant to provide an accounting of the unlawful surcharges it collected in violation of Oregon law in the past year, and an order requiring defendant to preserve all documents and information (and electronically stored information) pertaining to this case.

21.

## REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by a jury.

22.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff respectfully requests relief against defendant as sought in paragraphs 19 and 20, and any other relief the Court may deem appropriate, and an order appointing class counsel and an order certifying this case as a class action.

October 19, 2019

**RESPECTFULLY FILED,**

/s/ Michael Fuller  
**Michael Fuller, OSB No. 09357**  
Lead Attorney for Plaintiff  
OlsenDaines  
US Bancorp Tower  
111 SW 5th Ave., Suite 3150  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
[michael@underdoglawyer.com](mailto:michael@underdoglawyer.com)  
Direct 503-222-2000

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I cause this document to be served on:

**State of Oregon  
c/o Oregon Department of Justice  
1162 Court St. NE  
Salem, Oregon 97301-4096**

October 19, 2019

/s/ Michael Fuller  
**Michael Fuller, OSB No. 09357**  
Lead Attorney for Plaintiff  
OlsenDaines  
US Bancorp Tower  
111 SW 5th Ave., Suite 3150  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
[michael@underdoglawyer.com](mailto:michael@underdoglawyer.com)  
Direct 503-222-2000